7. *Trial by Jury.*—The number of cases tried by Jury was 21 against 22 in 1926-27 and the Judges agreed with the verdict of the Jury wholly in 18 cases and the remaining 3 cases were referred to the Chief Court under Section 307, Criminal Procedure Code.

8. *Preventive Jurisdiction.*—One hundred and fifty-nine persons against 83 in 1926-27 were ordered to give security during the year.

9. *Appellate Work.*—The appeals of 589 persons were before Sessions Judges who disposed of the appeals of 412 persons against 331 in the year previous and 310 in 1925-26. The average duration was 33·3 days against 48·1 days in 1926-27, this improvement being contributed mainly by the Sessions Court, Bangalore, substantially reducing the average duration of the appeals before it from 49·8 days in 1926-27 to 23·6 days in the year under review. The Magistrates had before them the appeals of 596 persons and disposed of those of 540, against 659 persons in the previous year and there was a slight increase in the average duration also. It is hoped that the Magistrates will dispose of their appellate work more expeditiously in future.

10. *Chief Court Work.*—Owing to the withdrawal from 1st December 1927 of the appellate jurisdiction which had been conferred on the Chief Court to hear and decide all such appeals as are allowed by law to the Court of Sessions in the Bangalore Division, the number of appeals filed in the Chief Court during the year decreased from 131 in the year 1926-27 to 93 in the year under review. Out of these 9 appeals were transferred to the Sessions Judge, Bangalore Division, and including 27 appeals pending from the previous year, there were for disposal 111 appeals against 119 in the previous year. The number disposed of was 92 as in the previous year, and the increase in the average duration to 77·27 days against 51·75 days in the previous year is explained to be due to the disposal of all the old appeals of the year 1926-27.

11. *Work of the Special Magistrates under the Separation Scheme.*—Including the cases pending from the previous year, the stipendiary Magistrates had 9,918 cases for disposal, out of which they disposed of 8,099 cases (or 82 per cent) leaving 1,819 cases pending. The disposals were below the normal by about 3 per cent. Out of 288 cases pending for over 6 months, 125 were in the Bangalore District. The Magistrates in this District should be directed to dispose of these old cases as early as possible and the District Magistrate should exercise greater scrutiny over their work.

12. *Bench Courts.*—The Bench Courts had 8,671 cases for disposal of which they disposed of 7,239 cases, or 83 per cent. It is a matter for regret that these Courts in general have left the impression that they are not working satisfactorily and have not inspired confidence in the public. One of these courts had to be abolished recently and a stipendiary Magistrate directed to hold his court instead at the place for a few days every month. It is proposed to introduce this arrangement throughout the State as far as practicable.

13. *Inspection.*—The Chief Judge inspected the Courts of the District Magistrates and First Class Magistrates in the Bangalore, Kolar, Tumkur and Hassan Districts. Mr. Justice D. K. Rama Rao inspected the District Magistrate's Court, Mysore, and the 3 First Class Magistrates' Courts in the District, while Mr. Justice G. Sreenivasa Iyer inspected the District Magistrates' Courts and the First Class Magistrates' Courts in Shimoga and Chitaldrug Districts. Mr. Justice M. Ramachandra Rao inspected the District Magistrate's and First Class Magistrate's Courts at Chikmagalur. The District Magistrates of Bangalore, Tumkur, Hassan, Shimoga and Kadur inspected all the Courts in their respective Districts and the District Magistrates of Kolar, Mysore and Chitaldrug inspected all the Courts except certain Bench Courts in their Districts.

P. MAHADEVAYYA,
Secretary to Government,
Law Department.

Designation of Magistrates' Courts.

READ—

Letter No. 505—28-29, dated 21st December 1928, from the Registrar, Chief Court, stating that in order to avoid possible confusion the Judges propose that at places where there are two Special Magistrates' Courts, the Court of the Magistrate permanently exercising First Class powers may be designated as the First Magistrate's Court and the other Court as the Second Magistrate's Court.

ORDER No. P. 3975-84—CTS. 146-28-2, DATED 29TH JANUARY 1929.

Government agree with the Judges of the Chief Court and direct that the Special First Class Magistrate's Court and the Special Second Class Magistrate's Court at each of the following places, namely, Bangalore, Kolar, Tumkur, Shimoga and Chitaldrug, be designated as the First Magistrate's Court and the Second Magistrate's Court respectively.

P. MAHADEVAYYA,
Secretary to Government,
Law Department.

Reviews the Report on the Administration of Civil Justice in the State for the year 1927-28.

READ—

The Report on the Administration of Civil Justice in Mysore for 1927-28, received from the Registrar, Chief Court, with his letter No. P. 38—27-28, dated 10th October 1928.

ORDER No. P. 4072-73—CTS. 89-28-2, DATED 31ST JANUARY 1929.

Recorded.

2. *Number of Courts.*—The total number of courts at the close of the year under the Chief Court was 34, consisting of the Courts of 3 District Judges, 5 Subordinate Judges (including 2 temporary Subordinate Judges at Mysore and Shimoga), one Small Cause Judge and 25 Munsiffs (including one temporary Munsiff at Sagar). There were in addition 186 Village Courts, of which only 117 were actually working.

3. *Original Work.—(a) Institutions.*—There was an appreciable increase in the number of suits instituted, *viz.*, from 37,239 (15,594 ordinary and 21,645 Small Cause) in the previous year to 43,646 (19,170 ordinary and 24,476 Small Cause) in the year under review. This latter number includes 3,814 suits pending on 14th October 1927, which were transferred from Court to Court as a result of the establishment of new courts and the consequent readjustment of jurisdiction from that date and the net increase in institutions was 2,593 over those of the previous year.

(*b*) *Disposals.*—The courts started work with an opening balance of 17,193 suits and, with fresh institutions and suits re-filed and remanded, had 58,154 suits for disposal. They disposed of 39,259 suits (16,389 ordinary and 22,870 Small Cause) against 38,374 (15,978 ordinary and 22,396 Small Cause) in the previous year. In spite of this improvement in the number of suits disposed of, the pendency rose from 17,193 in 1926-27 to 18,895 in consequence of the large increase in the number of institutions during the year. Government are glad to observe that greater attention is being paid to the disposal of old cases. The number of applications for setting aside orders of dismissal and exparte decrees, however, continued to be on the increase and points to the need for checking hasty disposal.

Duration.—Government are glad to observe that the establishment of additional courts has, as anticipated, tended to reduce the average duration of suits. The average duration of contested ordinary suits decreased from 551·6 days in 1926-27 to 515·5 days in the year under review, that of contested small causes from 267·2 to 228·1 days and of both kinds of suits together from 442·8 to 394·84 days.

4. *Execution of Decrees.*—Including 29,317 applications pending from the previous year there were for disposal 80,527 applications for execution of decrees against 71,480 in 1926-27. The number disposed of was 50,676 against 42,153 in the previous year leaving 29,851 pending at the close of the year against 29,327 at the end of 1926-27. The percentage of applications that proved wholly infructuous also showed an improvement, being 52·2 against 58·9 in the previous year, but is still very large and demands further attention.